ON THE ENCLITIC *NE* IN EARLY LATIN

A DISSERTATION

FOR THE

ACQUISITION OF THE DEGREE

OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

AT THE

KAISER-WILHELMS-UNIVERSITÄT STRASSBURG

BY

MINTON WARREN

OF PROVIDENCE U. S. A.

BALTIMORE & STRASSBURG
1881.

[From the American Journal of Philology, Vol. 2, No. 5.]

ON THE ENCLITIC *NĔ* IN EARLY LATIN.

By Minton Warren.

Within the last twenty years much attention has been paid to the peculiarities of early Latin. Striking deviations from the usage of the classical period have been pointed out in the regimen of verbs, in the signification and use of certain particles and conjunctions, and in the principles governing the subordination of clauses. A multitude of monographs have contributed valuable material for the construction of an historical syntax. Not to speak of others, Lübbert has traced the development of *quom*, Kienitz of *quīn*, and Becker, in Studemund's Studien Bd. I, has made a most exhaustive study of the Syntax of Indirect Questions in Early Latin. The enclitic *ne*, commonly known as the Interrogative Particle, has not to my knowledge received a special treatment in recent times. It occurs about 1100 times in Plautus and over 400 times in Terence. Hence a discussion of its use which should aim in any sense to be exhaustive would far exceed the limits of a journal article. I shall therefore in the following pages content myself with the attempt to show that in the earliest Latin the use of this particle was not confined to questions. I shall then seek to establish a probability in favor of the existence of two particles *nĕ* distinct in origin and signification.

I proceed at once to treat the passages where *ne* is found in the MSS. with no interrogative force, for which reason the text has in most cases suffered violence at the hands of the editors.

Mil. 309 (II 3, 38). The slave Sceledrus, on discovering that Philocomasium has eluded his vigilance, gives utterance to his agitation and alarm in the following words:

> Édepol facinus fécit audax. Hócine si milés sciat
> Crédo hercle hasce aedís sustollat tótas atque me ín crucem.

Hocine BD, *hoc me* C.[1] In line 310 I follow Fleckeisen and Brix; see Tyrrell's ed. for MSS. readings. Pareus keeps *hocine* and

[1] Lorenz says, Philol. 32, p. 302, Auch C hat *hoc ine* welches Klotz sogar vertheidigt. Bergk vermuthet *hóce si milés sciat.*

puts an exclamation point after *sciat*. Ritschl's change to *hoc nunc* is adopted by Brix, Lorenz, Fleckeisen and Tyrrell. Fleckeisen however in Jahrb. 105, p. 71, proposes to read *hoc enim*. Langen treating of *enim*, in Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung des Plautus, p. 270, gives *hoc nunc* the preference. Lest the position of *hercle*, which usually follows *si* immediately (cf. Epid. 326), should excite suspicion, I call attention to Persa, 627 f.

Tu si hanc émeris
Númquam hercle hunc mensém vortentem, crédo, servibít tibi.

Epid. 73 (I 1, 73):

Haécine ubi scibít senex
Púppis pereundást probe.

Hęcine B, *haeccine* J, *hec* F, *hecine* E (cf. Goetz' ed. of Curculio p. ix.) Müller, Plaut. Pros. p. 732, proposes to emend by reading *haec hercle* or *haec hodie*. Goetz is wisely conservative. Although he makes no explanation, he evidently does not regard *haecine* as introducing a question. Pareus puts an interrogation point after *senex*.

Mil. 565 (II 6, 82):

Orátionemque SC. Égone si post húnc diem
Muttívero etiam quód egomet certó sciam
Dato éxcruciandum me: égomet me dedám tibi.

Although the Ambrosianus with BCD has *egone*, the editors with one accord substitute *ego nunc*. So too Tyrrell, without even mentioning in his critical apparatus the reading of the MSS.

And. 478 (III 1, 20):

Hicíne me si inparátum in veris núptiis
Adórtus esset, quós mihi ludos rédderet?

Hiccine BCD^{1}G^{1}P (*Hicine* D^{2}E, *Hic* G ex ras.) Some of the codices of Donatus give *Hic si me imparatum*, but the best codex, the Parisinus, gives *Hic me misi in partū*, evidently a corruption of *hicine me si inparatum*. Consequently any change here is directly in the face of the best MS. authority. Bothe however does not scruple to transpose *me*, and reads *Hic inparatum me si*. Fleckeisen, Klotz, Meissner, and Umpfenbach follow him. Wagner reads *hic nunc me*. Conradt, Metrische Composition der Comödien des Terenz, p. 117, reads *Hic nē*, "da die Fragepartikel durchaus fortgeschafft werden muss." Spengel nevertheless in his edition makes bold to retain *hicine*, citing for its support Mil. 309

and 565. His theory of explanation, however, involving as it does an anacoluthon, I cannot in view of all the facts accept. It does not fit all the other cases.

Mil. 936 (III 3, 62):

> Bene ámbula, bene rém gere. At egone hóc si ecficiam pláne
> Ut cóncubinam mílitis meus hóspes habeat hódie
> Atque hínc Athenas ávehat si hodie húnc dolum dolámus
> Quid tíbi ego mittam múneris?

Egone B, *egonec* CD. Here metrical considerations forbid the mere substitution of *nunc* for *ne* and the editors have been pushed to other devices. Müller, Nachträge zur Plaut. Pros. p. 82, proposes *ego hoc nunc si*. Ritschl too by transposition inserts his favorite *nunc* so as to read *At ego nunc si ecficiam hoc plane*. So too Fleckeisen and Lorenz. Seyffert (Philol. xxix, p. 399) finds *nunc* here "höchst matt und überflüssig," and looks upon *ne* or *nec* as a mere dittograph of *hoc*. Brix approves of this view and would have us read (with hiatus) *at ego hoc si ecficiam plane*, which is simply a return to Bothe's reading (in my copy of 1821). I wish to make it apparent how much trouble the editors have taken to get rid of a simple *ne*, which, if a rational explanation can be found for it, must after all be retained. I know of no better parallel for this particular passage than is furnished by Poen. I 3, 18 (420 Geppert). To appreciate the scene, one must picture to himself the youth Agorastocles quite overjoyed at the prospect of outwitting a pimp and getting possession of the lovely Adelphasium. Milphio, his slave and willing agent in the matter, has been too often wheedled by fair promises to put faith in them any longer, and hence, when his master begins a long-winded sentence promising him his freedom, he interrupts him at every turn, and bids him go bring the witnesses.

> AG. Egone édepol, si istuc lépide ecfexis. MI. Í modo
> AG. Ut nón ego te hodie. MI. Abí modo. AG. Emittám manu
> MI. I módo. AG. Non hercle mérear pro hoc. MI. Abi, abí modo
> AG. Quantum Ácherunti est mórtuorum. MI. Etiámne abis?
> AG. Neque quántum aquai ín mari est. MI. Abitúrun es?

The enigmatical character of the whole speech, which is too long to quote entire, is shown by the words of Milphio as he goes off in a rage, muttering:

> Nam istí quidem hercle orátioni est Oédipo
> Opus cóniectore.

It has puzzled the editors as well. I have given the text of Geppert except that I have omitted the interrogation point after *manu*. The only emendation which specially concerns us here is that of *egone egone* found in ABCD to *egone edepol*. This may have been suggested to Geppert by Men. 1023 (1025 Bx),

Érgo edepol, si récte facias, ére, me[d]emittás manu.

Bothe omits one *egone* and makes no attempt to heal the halting verse. *Egone* is most likely a dittograph, and *edepol* is on the whole a probable substitution. If accepted, however, it precludes the idea of a question, since it is not employed either by Plautus or Terence in interrogative sentences. Bothe in fact does not seem to regard *egone* as introducing a question, but indicates by leaders placed after *manu* that Agorastocles' speech is broken off. Pareus reads *egone? egone! si*, etc., but his commentary shows that he caught the true sense of the passage. He interprets thus, "ego profecto te manumittam si istuc feceris," and again, "non hercle velim pro mercede mortuos omnes consequi, etc., ut non te mittam manu si . . . effeceris." An exactly parallel use of *ut non* occurs in Bacch. 1184[R],

Quem quídem ego ut nón [hodie] éxcruciem, alterúm tantum non méream.

Hodie was added by Hermann. The MSS. have *alterum tantum auri*, which Fleckeisen and Ussing keep, the latter without inserting *hodie*[1] (cf. also Stich. 24, Men. 218.) Both in Mil. 936 and Poen. 420, *egone* must be retained, but not as part of an interrogation. Agorastocles' words taken connectedly give then the following sense or nonsense: "I in good sooth, so you play cleverly your part, would not forego the giving you this day your freedom, to earn as many as are the dead in Acheron, nor yet as many as are the waters in the sea, nor as all clouds that are, nor as the stars in heaven," etc.

The next example which I shall cite is very similar. Asin. 884 (V 2, 34):

PA. Aúdin quid ait? ART. Aúdio. DE. Egone ut nón domo uxorí meae
Súbrupiam in delíciis pallam quam hábet atque ad te déferam
Nón edepol condúci possum víta uxoris annua.

Fleckeisen and most editors put an interrogation point after

[1] In Bursian's Jahresbericht for 1881, Heft 3, p. 39, I find that Brachmann follows Fleckeisen, but reads *altrum*. Perhaps we should read, *Quem quídem egone ut non éxcruciem, altrum tántum auri non méream*, cf. Haut. 950, *Syrum quidem egone*, etc., see below

deferam. The usual conditions under which the *egone ut* questions are employed by Plautus are not here fulfilled, as is clearly admitted by Kraz (Stuttgart Program, 1862, p. 33). Ussing cites the parallel passage Cas. 400[Gep.] (II 8, 68):

> Tribus nón conduci póssum libertátibus
> Quin égo illis hodie cómparem magnúm malum,

and reads *Ego nē*, but the *ne* is certainly enclitic. It seems to me that there is no more interrogative force felt in *ut non* than in *quin*, although I admit that in an earlier period the construction itself may have grown out of a paratactic question, as has been proved for *quin* clauses.

In Haut. 950 (V 1, 77) the Codex Bembinus reads:

> Séd Syrum quidem égone si vivo ádeo exornatúm dabo
> Ádeo depexum, út dum vivat méminerit sempér mei.

The MSS. of the Calliopian recension BCDEHGP have, according to Umpfenbach, *Sed Syrum* MEN *Quid eum?* CHR *Egone? si vivo*, except that G has *ergo me*. From personal examination, however, I can state that Cod. Par. 7899, Umpfenbach's P, has no interrogation point after *egone*, although it is commonly found in P after questions. Cod. Par. 7900 A saec. X on the other hand reads *egone?* Nonius Marcellus cites the latter part of this verse twice to illustrate *Depexum* and *Exornare* (cf. Quicherat's ed. pp. 7 and 336). The MSS. have *egone*. Quicherat inconsistently reads *ego nae* in the first place and *egone?* in the second. Even as early as the fourth century, however, the corruption of the text (which was no doubt due to a misunderstanding of the use of *egone*) had taken place. Donatus in his commentary on Adelph. III 3, 46 quotes thus, *Sed Syrum* ME. *Quid eum?* Bentley, without knowing the reading of the Bembinus, saw at once the impropriety of keeping *egone?* as a question. I give his comment somewhat abridged. "*Egone* semper respondet verbo secundae personae ut Phorm. I 2, 7. *Sed quid tu es tristis? Egone?* Huic igitur loco non convenit. Repone *Séd Syrum. Quid eum? Égo si vivo, eum ádeo exornatúm dabo.*" Fleckeisen discusses the passage (Philol. II, p. 76, 1847) and proposes *Sed Syrum* M. *Quid eum?* CH. *nē ego si vivo*, etc. In his ed. of 1865, however (not, as it seems, having ascertained the Bembine's reading), he gives, with hiatus, *Sed Syrum quidem ego si vivo*, etc. Wagner, both in his German and English edition of the play, adopts *egomet*, Klette's emenda-

tion (Rhein. Mus. XIV, p. 467). Shuckburgh, the latest editor (1878), who however has never heard of Umpfenbach's critical edition, follows Fleckeisen. For *quidem* used before a conditional clause, to make emphatic a preceding accusative, I need only to refer to the passage cited above, Bacch. 1184, and And. 164, *quem quidem ego si sensero.* If MS. authority is to have any weight in the passages above discussed, *egone* stands in need of no defence. Its meaning may be illustrated by the early use of the asseverative *enim* to emphasize a conditional statement, Persa 236, *Enim non ibis nunc vicissim nisi scio.* Compare the similar use of the stronger compound *enim vero,* Phorm. 937, *Enim véro si porro ésse odiosi pérgitis . .* where the threat is broken off by Demipho's asking *Quid facies?*

In seven of the examples already given it must have been noticed that *ne* precedes a conditional clause. Hidden away amid the critical apparatus of Terence I have found a *tun* which I think may now claim admission to the text.

Adelph. 770 (V 1, 8):

> Tun sí meus esses. . . SY. Dís quidem esses Démea
> Ac tuám rem constabilísses. DE. exemplo ómnibus
> Curárem ut esses.

G alone has *tu.* Umpfenbach attributes the *n* of *tun* in P to a second hand. I myself could see no trace of a correction, and there is no crowding of the letters. As there is evidently no interrogation here, the editors with one consent have eliminated the *n.* The interrupted threat of Demea, to which Syrus gives so witty a turn, is taken up again in the words *exemplo omnibus.* The form *tun* shows convincingly what we might have inferred equally well from the forms *hicine, hocine,* that the *ne* in these formulas is enclitic and short, and therefore this *ne* is not to be identified with the prepositive *nē,* as has sometimes happened in the passages containing *egone si.*

The next example is of a somewhat different character. Pseud. 371 (I 3, 137):

> Ecquid té pudet?
> BAL. Tén amatorem ésse inventum inánem quasi cassám nucem.

Ten is found only in the Ambrosianus, the other MSS. have *te.* Ritschl in his edition writes *ted* to obviate hiatus, tacitly recognizing the fact that the infinitive depends directly on *pudet,* and that there is no room here either for a question or an indignant exclamation.

In Neue Plaut. Excurse, Heft I, p. 44, he prefers to keep *ten*, adding, "obgleich die Erklärung des Fragesatzes im dortigen Zusammenhange nicht ganz einfach ist." Bergk, in his treatise on Auslautendes D im alten Latein, p. 53, remarks, "Ich wünschte R. hätte diese Erklärung gegeben; denn mir erscheint das fragende *ne* dort ganz unstatthaft." He calls attention too to the fragment of Ennius quoted by Cic. de Div. I 31, 66:

Hoc dolet
Mén obesse, illós prodesse, me óbstare, illos óbsequi.

where AV have *men*, which Ribbeck retains, Trag. Frag. p. 21. Bergk's own suggestion that the *n* is either a phonetic affix to prevent hiatus or a relic of the old accusative ending *m*, hardly deserves serious consideration. Fleckeisen keeps *tene* as question, Brix in Jahn's Jahrb. 115, p. 331, discusses the passage at length. giving as the proper reading for verse 370:

Númquid aliud étiam voltis dícere? CAL. Ecquid té pudet?

He too reads *ten* etc., as a sort of jeering retort made by the leno in the form of a question dependent in thought upon *pudet*. If we compare however passages like Adelph. 432 *Numquíd vis?* DE. *Mentem vóbis meliorém dari*, and Mil. 617 f.:

PE. Quíd id est quod cruciát? cedo.
PL. Mé tibi istuc aetátis homini fácinora puerília
Óbicere, etc.

I think it will be admitted that a direct statement dependent on *pudet* understood is much more natural. *Ten* has the force of *te enim* or *te vero*, only somewhat weaker. This is made clear by two analogous passages, Capt. 566^{Bx} (III 4, 36):

Tu énim repertu's, Phílocratem qui súperes verivérbio.

and Pseud. 631^{R} (II 2, 36):

Váe tibi: tu invéntus vero, méam qui furcillés fidem.

In dependent statement *tu enim repertus* might have been expressed by Plautus thus, *ten esse repertum*. Lorenz, although he reads Pseud. 359 (=371^{R}) *ted esse inventum*, translates "Ja darüber dass du," and this *ja* gives the sense of *ne* or *enim*. In Pseud. 631, Plautus may have written *Váe tibi: tún inventus vero*, which would relieve us of the necessity of either admitting hiatus after *tu* or scanning *tibí*. The *n* would fall out very easily before *inventus*, as it has in Pseud. 371 in all the MSS. except A. With the verbs

invenio and *reperio* the use of some affirmative particle may have been especially common. Another instance is furnished by Eun. 930 (V 4, 8):

tum hoc álterum,
Id vérost quod ego míhi puto palmárium
Men répperisse, quó modo adulescéntulus
Meretrícum ingenia et móres posset nóscere, etc.

A has MEN at first hand, but some late scribe has struck out the N. The Vaticanus also has *meṇ*. The editors read *me*, but *men* must be kept, I think, as another instance of survival. Lest I may seem over-hasty in claiming for *ne* the force of *enim* I wish to call in here the evidence of an old glossary. On p. 52 of Codex Par. 7610 (saec. XIII) 2d part, at the close of quite a long article on *ne*, I found these words: "*Ne* adverbium corripitur scilicet pro *enim* vel pro *nonne* hoc est interrogativum vel affirmativum. Dehortativum vero producitur et conjunctio similiter." (Exactly the same words may be read in Cod. Par. 7611 (saec. XIII) p. 105, and Cod. Par. 7612 (saec. XIV) p. 115.) The testimony is unequivocal. I wish I might trace it back to its first source. I could show, if space permitted, that much of the article on *ne* coincides in phraseology with Priscian, and represents good grammatical tradition; but I have searched through Keil's edition of the Grammatici Latini in vain for any coupling of *enim* and *nonne* to explain different sides of *nĕ*. In the light of this gloss it is interesting to recall Fleckeisen's emendation of *hocine* to *hoc enim* in Mil. 309, and Langen's proposal to substitute *mihine?* for *mihi enim?* in Casina II 6, 14 (cf. Beiträge p. 267.) Seyffert too would substitute in Rud. 1003 *Itane vero?* for *Ita enim vero?* which does not occur elsewhere. In my judgment we must also recognize the enclitic *nĕ* in the following passage, Curc. 138 ff. (I 2, 47):

Tu mé curato né sitiam: ego tíbi quod amas iam huc ádducam.
PHAED. Tibine égo, si fidem servás mecum vineám pro aurea statuá statuam,
Quae tuó gutturi sit mónimentum.

Tibi ne ego, BEJF. To the separation of *tibi* and *ne* in the MSS. no great importance can be attached. It often occurs where the *ne* stands in a question, cf. Curc. 419 *tu ne* in B, 82 *ei ne* BE. Müller, Plaut. Pros. p. 405, reads with transposition, *ne ego tibi*, etc. Fleckeisen (cf. Philologus II, p. 107) omitting *tibi* reads *né ego, si fidém* [*tu*] *mecum sérvas aureá pro statua*. Mahler, in his dissertation De Pronominum Personalium apud Plautum collo-

catione, has shown that *ego tibi* is the normal position unless special emphasis is to be given the pronoun of the second person. Here *tibi* is emphatic, and the *ne* belongs more properly to it than to *ego*. If *ego* were emphatic and *ne* the asseverative particle of which Fleckeisen treats, we should expect this order, *nē ego tibi*. There is no certain proof, as we shall see later, that *nē* is found postpositive with pronouns. The reading *tibine* is still further supported by the fact that a conditional clause *si fidem servas* follows; but even without this it might be defended by the following remarkable passage, where *ne*, undoubtedly enclitic, occurs and is retained by the latest editor, Goetz, Epid. 541 (IV 1, 14):

Pláne hicinest is, qui ín Epidauro prímus pudicitiám mihi pepulit.

The MSS. have *hicine* or *hiccine; is* has been added by Goetz. Camerarius emends to *hic ille est*. Prof. Studemund has been kind enough to furnish me with his own reading of the Ambrosianus, which, as it differs somewhat from that of Loewe, I will here give. The verse is divided up between two lines. At the end of the first LANE KIC . . . S . can be deciphered with space enough for HICINEST. In the second line, after a brief space, INEPIDAURO VIRGINI PRIMUS PUDI . . . IAM PE . . ULIT. *Pepulit* was probably miswritten *perpulit*. Either *primus*, which is found in the other MSS. also, or *virgini*, must be due to a gloss. I prefer to keep *primus* and to regard 540 and 541 as anapaestic septenarii.

540. Certo eást, quam in Epidauró memini me paúperculam conprímere.
PHIL. Plane hícinest qui mihi in Épidauro primús pudicitiam pépulit.

The parallelism between these two emphatic statements will be perceived at once. There is not a shadow of a question present. The *hicine* is simply a stronger *hic*, if you choose *hic enim* or *hic vero*.

Other corresponding cases of *hicine* I confess I have not found. The usage must have been obsolescent even in the time of Plautus. Later recensions may have removed the few cases of its occurrence, and substituted other expressions in their place. Geppert, so far as I know, is the only modern editor who for the sake of the verse has inserted *nĕ* where there is no interrogation. I am unable to learn, from the books at my command, that he has anywhere explained the usage, or supported it by such examples based on MS. authority as I have given. For the sake of completeness I

give the passages which in a note on Trin. 589 (see his ed. p. 163) he has thus emended: Pseud. 348 *huncine*, 410 *hucine*, 954 *illicinest*, 1175 *hicine;* Rud. 778 *huncine*, 1357 *illicine;* Stich. 435 *huncine;* Trin. 590 *istucine*.

I cannot undertake to discuss these passages here. It is no part of my present purpose to bring forward the letter *n* as a rival of the ablatival *d* with which some editors have so liberally besprinkled the text of the early poets. I shall be satisfied if I succeed in shielding it in the passages where it does occur. To do this more effectually, I propose to show that an enclitic *nĕ* with affirmative force is recognized by the ancient grammarians, as may be proved from their works and from glossaries founded upon ancient sources. I have already given one such proof above.

Priscian (Keil II, p. 101) says: "Dubitativae sunt, quae dubitationem significant, ut *an*, *ne* correpta, *necne* . . . (I omit the examples) frequentissime tamen eaedem interrogativae sunt, ut Virgilius in III[1] Aeneidos: *Hectoris Andromache Pyrrhin' conubia servas?* Idem in X:[2] *tanton' me crimine dignum?* Haec eadem invenitur et pro confirmativa ut Horatius in II[3] sermonum:

Clarus erit, fortis, iustus, sapiensne etiam et rex.

Idem in I:[4]

O seri studiorum, quine putetis
Difficile et miruin Rhodio quod Pitholeonti
Contigit.

Terentius in Andria:[5]

Nuncine demum istud verbum in te incidit.

Hic enim *ne* conjunctio nec interrogativa, nec dubitativa, sed confirmativa est. Virgilius in X:[6]

Tantane me tenuit vivendi, nate, voluptas
Ut pro me hostili paterer succumbere dextra?

Est enim pro *etiam*."

It will be noticed that in all these passages it is the enclitic *nĕ* of which Priscian is treating, and not the asseverative *ne* to which (Keil II, p. 479) he assigns the meaning τὸ πάνυ and the circumflex accent. Priscian's use of the terms *affirmativa* and *confirmativa*

[1] Aen. III 319.
[2] Aen. X 668.
[3] Hor. Sat. II 3, 97.
[4] Hor. Sat. I 10, 21.
[5] Cf. And. V 3, 11 and 14, and IV 1, 59.
[6] Aen. X 846.

may be better understood by reference to the following passages, Keil II, pp. 85, 103, 156, 243, 253, 287, 337, et al. He includes under them the Greek δή and the Latin *nam*, *enim*, *ergo*, *etiam*, in particular phases of their use; e. g. for *enim* in affirmative sense he very properly cites (Keil II, p. 104) Adelph. II 1, 14 *enim non sinam*. As *confirmativa* he also enumerates (II, p. 85) *profecto*, *scilicet*, *quippe*, *videlicet* and *nempe*. Now *nempe* is one of those particles in the pronunciation of which the nicest discrimination is required to settle upon the proper voice-inflection, and we get no comfort here from the editors. The very passage cited by Priscian from Persius to illustrate the affirmative sense of *nempe*, namely Sat. III 1, *nempe haec assidue*, is given by Jahn and Duebner with a question mark, by Hart with an exclamation point, by Gildersleeve, Pretor and Heinrich with a colon. The scholiast too regards it as a question and attaches to *nempe* the sense of *numquid non*. Acron in his commentary on Horace, Sat. I 10, 1, says: "*Nempe* aut interrogantis aut confirmantis." In Trin. 427. (II 4, 25):

LE. Nempe quás spopondi. ST. immó 'quas despondi' inquito.

Pareus, Ritschl, and Wagner have a period after *spopondi;* Fleckeisen, Geppert and Brix a question mark. Riley translates "These, I suppose that I was security for?" Bonnel Thornton renders very briefly "I engaged for." Shall we then cry out that Pareus, Ritschl, Wagner and Thornton are perfect dolts because they did not see, what ought to have been as plain as day, that *nempe quas spopondi* is a question? or shall we call Brix an ignoramus because he did not divine that a Roman spendthrift would certainly have dropped his voice before he reached that melancholy word *spopondi?* Yet Hand's treatment of Priscian is not more fair when he says, Tursellinus, vol. IV, p. 73, "Nemo vero incautius in hac re versatus est quam Priscianus. Nam postquam exposuerat *ne* et dubitationem significare et in interrogatione poni, loquitur de vi confirmativa, collatis exemplis prorsus alienis et male expositis ita, ut ad extremum addat: *est enim pro etiam.*" Let us look at these 'exempla prorsus aliena' a little more closely. It is well to premise that when Priscian calls *ne* a dubitative particle he does not deny that *Iustitiaene prius mirer belline laborum?* is a question, and when he speaks of *ne* as confirmative, he refers to the intrinsic value of the particle, and to the peculiar coloring which it gives to any utterance, and he is

not at pains to tell us what inflection we are to give the voice. He leaves it free to the scholiast of Persius to decide that *nempe* is a question, but he has felt nevertheless the true force of *nempe*. The Vergil passage beginning *tantane*, speaks for itself. It is a question and Priscian recognized it as such, and yet he interprets *ne* by *etiam*, which he elsewhere styles confirmative. So *sapiensne*, if I mistake not, would mean for Romans 'wise forsooth,' and might be so pronounced as to convey to one person the feeling of questioning doubt, to another of ironical assurance. Acron says of it, "Aut interrogatio audientis aut dicentis dubitatio." To my mind *ne* has quite the force of *nempe* in Hor. Ep. I 16, 31:

> 'nempe
> Vir bonus et prudens dici delector ego ac tu.'

An instructive Plautine parallel for *quine* is found in Epid. 449 (III 4, 13):

> Ego súm si quid vis. MIL. Némpe quem in adulescéntia
> Memoránt apud reges ármis, arte duéllica
> Divitias magnas índeptum?

Here of course the relative clause is not one of characteristic requiring the subjunctive, but this does not affect the force of *nempe*. Acidalius changes for metrical reasons *nempe quem* to *quemne*, in which he is followed by Goetz. We shall see later on that Scaliger identifies this *ne* of *quemne* with the *ne* of *tune* (commonly written *tu ne*), which every one admits to be affirmative. Porphyrion moreover says, "*ne* adjectum, ut *egone, tune;* abundat *ne* syllaba." Acron quotes Priscian, but is evidently in the same confusion in which most of the modern editors are. For the very latest theory on this subject see Keller, Epilegomena zu Horaz, p. 507,[1] where *quine* is said to be the fuller form for *quin* and *qui* a modal-instrumental. Does Keller mean to assign to *quine* the force of 'how not'? Really the most sensible comment which I have found is that of Cruquius. "Videtur autem mihi," he says, "esse Atticismus pro οἵ γε[2] *qui utique, qui certe*, nam ea

[1] "Dieses *quine* ist, was bis jetzt noch Niemand beachtet zu haben scheint, die vollere Form für *quin*, nichts anderes; und *qui* ist somit nicht eigentlich der Nominativ, sondern der Instrumental-Modalis."

[2] Cf. Lucian Charon 24:

Ὦ τῆς ἀνοίας, οἵ γε οὐκ ἴσασιν—

and Ovid Fast. II 45:

> A! nimium faciles qui tristia crimina caedis
> Fluminea tolli posse putetis aqua!

particula γε familiaris est Demostheni in ea significatione." Not that I admit any influence of Atticism. But it may be claimed that at least in the Terence passage Priscian has most wofully blundered. His memory has indeed played him false, for he has mixed up three passages in one, but his interpretation is sound. No one will fail to be convinced of this who shall compare And. 683,

Nihil ád te, DÀ. Quaero. PA. Em, *núncin* demum? DA. At iam hóc tibi inventúm dabo,

with Cas. 421 (III 1, 11),

Méminero ST. Em! *nunc énim* te demum núllum scitum scítiust.

The *ne* in itself is as much affirmative in the one case as *enim* in the other. Here too we have an excellent illustration of the nearness of *ne* to *enim*, and the real worth of the gloss already given. And this brings me to the consideration of other glosses. Although Ritschl, Loewe and others have abundantly shown how much light may be shed on the signification of a word by a neglected gloss, as yet only a beginning has been made in the utilization of the riches which the old glossaries contain. It is to be hoped that before many years Loewe, whose admirable design is set forth in the Prodromus Corporis Glossariorum Latinorum (Leipzig, 1876), will provide us with the material. I have been able to examine for my special purpose most of the important glossaries to be found in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, and in the Libraries of Berne and St. Gall. For the sake of convenience I will here name the principal of these. Foremost of all is the famous Liber Glossarum Cod. Sangermanensis 12, 13, Parisinus 11529 and 11530 (cf. Loewe in Prod. p. 225, Wilmanns in Rhein. Mus. XXIV, p. 367, and Usener in same vol. p. 387). For some reason Prinz, who supplied Wilmanns with data in regard to this glossary, mentions only the early part of it as in existence. The glossary does not, however, as he states, close with E; the second tome, containing the letters F–Z, being designated by the catalogue number 11530. It contains 246 leaves, on the first of which is written, Antiqui glossarii pars secunda S. Germ. lat. 12, 2. The whole work is thus designated in the catalogue, "Glossarium antiquissimum Ansileubi putatur." Usener, whose patience in such investigation is well known, could get no definite information in regard to this worthy bishop. The codex belongs to the eighth century. I shall refer to it as A.

Cod. Bernensis	16, saec.	IX = *a*, is a copy of the Liber Glossarum, containing the letters A–E.		
" "	258 "	IX = *b*	} belong to the so-called affatim glossaries	
" "	224 "	X = *c*	} described by Loewe, Prod. p. 110 f.	
" "	A, 92, 1 "	IX = *d*		
" Parisinus	7640 "	X = *e*		
" "	7641 "	X = *f*		
" "	7642 "	XI = *g*		
" "	7643 "	XI = *h*		
" "	7644 "	XIII = *i*	} cf. Loewe, Prod. p. 229.	
" "	7610 "	XIII = *k*		
" "	7611 "	XIII = *l*		
" "	7612 "	XIV = *m*		
" "	7680 "	IX–X = *n*, Abavus Glossary, cf. Prod. p. 103.		
" "	7690 "	IX = *o*, has three separate vocabularies, cf. Prod. p. 88.		
" Sangallensis	907 "	VIII = *p*		
" "	908 "	VI–VIII = *q*		
" "	912 "	VIII = *r*. cf. Prod. p. 139.		
" "	238 "	VIII = *s*.		

Of printed glossaries I have consulted Glossarium Lat. Bibliothecae Par. antiquissimum saec. IX. (ed. Hildebrand, Goettingen 1854) = H; Luctatii Placidi Glossae (ed. Deuerling, Leipzig 1875) = P; and the glossary appended to De Vit's ed. of Forcellini's Latin Dictionary. Finally, through the kindness of Prof. Studemund of Strassburg I have had access to one of the rarest of incunabula, namely, 'Salomonis ecclesiae Constantiensis epi glosse' described by Usener, Rhein. Mus. XXIV, p. 389 = S.

I shall give first the glosses in which *ne* is interpreted by *ergo*.

egone : ego ergo. A a g h s c n.
egone : ego ergo vel numquid ego propterea. e S.
egone : ego ergo an ego. i.
egone : ego ergo numquid ego. n.
hecine : ista, hec ergo. A k l m g h i.
hocine : hoc ergo. q.
huncine : hunc ergo. q.
Placidi. *Istamcine* (sic) *: stam ergo.* A P.
Istancine : istam ergo an iste. k l.
istacine : ista ergo. i.
istanccine : ista ergo? an istam. f g.
De Glos. *mene : me ergo.* A d h i q s.
mene : vero pro anme vel me ergo. k l.

mene : vero pro amne vel me ergo. m.
nonne : non ergo. q s.
ne : ergo. s c.
nullane : ergo nulla. A.
satin : satis ergo. A h i.
tantane : tanta ergo. A h i n q.
tune : tu ergo. b n c.
tune : nunc tu vel vero, tu ergo. e.

It has thus been shown that in glossaries of widely different character and origin *ergo* is a very common interpretation of *ne*. But some of these glossaries are themselves as old as the VIII century. The sources must lie much further back. As we have seen, the gloss *istamcine : stam ergo* is due to Placidus and probably referred to a passage from Plautus, although this form does not occur in the extant plays. On the other hand the gloss *mene : me ergo*, which in the Liber Glossarum is preceded by the *nota* 'De Glos.', is probably due to some early commentator on Vergil, as also the gloss *tantane : tanta ergo*. Probus in discussing the use of *nĕ* (Keil IV, p. 145) quotes Verg. Aen. 1, 37, *mene incepto desistere victam?* and Aen. 1, 132, *tantane vos generis tenuit fiducia vestri?* which afterwards became stock illustrations of the grammarians. Now in his comment on the first passage Servius says, "*mene*, *ne* non vacat, significat enim *ergo* et est conjunctio rationalis, et *mene* sic habet emphasim ut *Ast ego quae divum incedo regina.*" Very like this is his comment on Verg. Bucol. 3, 21, "An mihi cantando victus non redderet ille. *An* pro *ergo* ut Cominianus dicit." It is remarkable that Charisius (Keil I, p. 229), commenting on the force of *an*, in the same passage says, "Sed Marcius Salutaris vir perfectissimus pro *ergo* rectius sensit." The inference then is perhaps not unfair that Servius borrowed from Cominianus, and Cominianus from Marcius Salutaris, who probably flourished early in the fourth century. He in turn may have borrowed it from some earlier grammarian. As the explanation of *ne* in *mene* by *ergo* became traditional doctrine, it need excite no wonder that the gloss was extended to numerous other cases, and thus found its way at last into the glossaries. It must be conceded then that the gloss itself may lay claim to a very respectable antiquity, that it antedates the Bembinus of Terence and the Ambrosianus of Plautus, as well as Donatus. There would seem to be no good reason why we should deny an equally early

origin to the interpretation of *ne* by *vero* found quite as frequently in the same glossaries, as will be seen from the following exhibit:

anne : an vero. A i.[1]
anne : nonne an vero adverbium interrogandi. g m.
hicine : hic vero. A, corrupted in h into *hiccine : hic virgo.*
hicine : ex ea re. A.
hiccine pro hicne, hiccine, hic vero ex ea re. i k l m.
De Glos. *Hoc : istud.* A.
Hocine : ocvero (sic). A.
hoc : istud vel tale } k l m g h c i o.
hoccine : hoc vero }
hoccine : hoc vero vel hoc usque hoc putas. n e S.
hocine : hoc verum. r.
hacine : hac ergo } i S k l.
hancine : istam vero }
hoscine : hos vero. q l k m i o n.
haecine : ita vero. p r.
Virgili *huncine—histum vero.* A i.
hunecine (sic): *istū vero an hunc.* k.
hunccine : istum vero an hunc. q h i l.
itane : ita vero. A q S.
De Glos. *itane : ita vero.* i.
itane : putas sic, ita ergo vero } e n S.
itine : ita vero }
mene : vero pro anme vel me ergo. l m.
tune : nunc tu vel vero tu ergo. e.

Compare with these H, p. 159, *haec inde : haec vero, haec vero : haec inde;* p. 162, *hiscinet : ipsius autem, hoccine : hoc vero;* p. 163, *hoscine : hos vero;* p. 186, *ita vero : itinestet, itine : ita vero.* Finally in i I have found *siccine : sic etiam.* That these glosses go back to an ancient source may, I think, be made clear by the following considerations: (1) The orthography itself of the Liber Glossarum points to a good source, for it is better than that which Priscian lays down as correct. He teaches (Keil I, p. 592), "*Ce* quoque solebant per omnes casus vetustissimi addere articularibus vel demonstrativis pronominibus, hoc est ab aspiratione incipientibus, ut *hicce, huiusce, haecce, hocce* unde *hoc* quasi duabus conso-

[1] This gloss may throw some light on Phorm. 175 where Dziatzko reads *eam anne* for the unintelligible *amare* of the MSS., and Eugraphius has *an vero*, which may be due to a gloss.

nantibus sequentibus solent poetae producere—et sic in antiquissimis codicibus invenitur bis *c* scriptum, quomodo est apud Terentium in Andria: *Hoccine* est credibile aut memorabile?"

Now of what date Priscian's 'codices antiquissimi' were we do not know. We see, however, that the false orthography with two *c*'s came in quite early. It is found in all the later MSS. of Plautus and Terence. Cf. Bacch. 1090, *hoccine* BCD; Haut. 203, *hunc cine* D; *hunccine* EF; And. 236, *hoccine* BCEGP. The Liber Glossarum agrees with the Bembinus and the Ambrosianus in having but one *c*, while the later glossaries have commonly two. (2) It has been shown by Usener (Rhein. Mus. XXIV, p. 383) that the *nota* 'Virgili' which is prefixed in A to the gloss *huncine: histum vero* indicates that the gloss was drawn either from a glossary to Vergil, or from a glossed MS. of Vergil based upon the commentary of Aelius Donatus. The *nota* 'De Glos.' prefixed in i to *itane: ita vero* also indicates a good source, and this with the fact that the same gloss occurs in the Liber Glossarum compels me to reject Loewe's hypothesis (Prodromus, p. 347) that the glosses *staec: ita vero* and *itine: ita vero* are only corruptions of a fuller gloss *itane vero: itine stec.* (3) The gloss *hoc: istud* which precedes in A *hocine: oc vero*, and which also has on the margin the *nota* 'De Glos.' takes in several other MSS. the form *hoc: istud vel tale.* The explanation by means of *talis* is found several times in Servius, cf. Aen. IX 481, I 253, and IV 237. So too Donatus to Hec. I 1, 3 remarks, *Hiscine* Ἐρώτησις id est *talibus.* It would seem then to be no unfair conclusion that the tradition of these glosses reaches back to the fourth century of our era. It may possibly go even further back. The gloss *hocine: hoc vero* vel *hoc usque*, which indicates clearly the intensive force of *hocine*, may well be compared with this gloss from Festus (Müller, p. 358–9), "Tamne: eo usque, ut Aelius Stilo et Opilius Aurelius interpretantur. Itaque Afranius: 'Tamne arcula tua plena est aranearum,'" which Paulus gives thus, "Tanne: eo usque, Afranius 'Tanne arcula tua plena est aranearum'" (cf. Ribbeck Com. Frag. p. 217). The spelling *tanne* is phonetic, as Müller remarks, pointing to Cicero's well-known statement that *cumnobis* was pronounced *cunnobis.* *Tamne* was probably of rare occurrence as compared with *sicine* or *itane.* It is not found in Terence. Our Plautine texts give it twice, Merc. 172, where the MSS. have *Tandem*, and Mil. 628 where B has *tam me*, the rest *tamine.* Better vouchers than Varro's teacher and than Opilius (or Opillius), whom Varro often follows, we could hardly desire.

Now nothing compels the conclusion that in the first instance all these glosses were made to explain *ne* used in interrogative sentences. We have seen that Plautus and Terence use *Hocine si*, *Egone si*, *Hicine si*, *Tun si*, etc. I have looked in vain in Plautus for an example of *ego vero si* or *hoc vero si*, or in fact of any pronoun thus strengthened by *vero* before a conditional clause. Cicero however does employ *vero* in this way. Compare e. g. Somn. Scip. VIII 1, *ego vero, siquidem—patet, enitar ;* De Domo 47, 122, *ego vero si—dicerem—defenderem ;* Cat. II v, *Hunc vero si secuti erunt sui comites*, where *vero* is something more than *but*. Cicero also uses *hic vero* in questions ; e. g. De Domo 38, 102, *Hanc vero, pontifices, labem turpitudinis et inconstantiae poterit populi Romani dignitas sustinere?* Plautus never uses *hic vero* in this way. What more natural then than for an acute observer, noticing the difference between the usage of Plautus and later writers in this respect, to explain *ne* by *vero?* A passage in Terence where the MSS. have *hic vero* preceding a conditional clause, here challenges our attention. Eun. 299 ff. (II 3, 8) :

> Hic véro est qui si occéperit
> Ludúm iocumque dícet fuisse illum álterum, ‖ praeut húius
> Rabies quáe dabit.

So reads the Bembinus. Instead of *dicet* BCDEGP have *dices*, and in v. 299 *amare* after *occeperit*. Modern editors following Bentley begin v. 301 with *praeut huius*. Priscian (Keil II, p. 50) quotes the passage in illustration of the use of *praeut*, giving *dices* the reading of the Calliopian recension, but not *amare*, although on Lindemann's evidence a Heidelberg codex has *qui sic amare occeperit*. Arusianus quotes with *dicet*. Wagner remarks on the difficulty of the passage and complains of previous editors for passing over it *sicco pede*. *Hic* and *qui* must of course refer to the youth Chaerea, whereas *dicet* if retained must have for its subject *senex*. This sudden change of subject may account for the confusion of Donatus, if we are to credit him with the following remark, "*Hic vero est :* Utrum senex an Chaerea? sed senex potius ;" and again, "*Hic vero est :* Senex (which is of course false) *Qui*, scilicet Chaerea." Compare with this Eugraphius' more intelligent explanation, "Hic adulescens, si amare coeperit, fratrem eius Phaedriam dices ludum et iocum fuisse, hoc est, non amasse." In his Comment. on Eun. II 3, 56 Donatus cites the line loosely thus, *O infortunatum senem, si et hic amare coeperit*. Bentley says of *dicet*, "eo ipso ineptum est, quod quivis aliquis aeque dixerit. Repone *dicas*." *Dices* if used of a definite person would

be supported by Eun. 567, *Primam dices, scio, si videris.* For *amare occepit* compare Adelph. 327, Eun. 568, Phorm. 82.

In view of passages already discussed it must be admitted that Terence might have written *Hicíne si amare occíperit*, etc. Did he, for the sake of being better understood by the coming generations, avoid an obsolescent usage, and for the sake of greater emphasis employ a rather awkward circumlocution the like of which does not occur in Plautus?—*hic vero est qui si.* As conservative critics we may not lay ruthless hands upon the manuscript tradition, but when we remember Ritschl's *dictum* (Proleg. P. CXXI),[1] "longius autem a Terentiana integritate Bembinus, quam a Plautina Ambrosianus abest," it is hard to escape the suspicion that this passage in its present form is due to a later revision, at a period perhaps when it was common to gloss *hicine* by *hic vero*.[2] This suspicion is rather increased by Schlee's comment on these lines in a recent dissertation, Berlin 1879, De versuum in Canticis Terentianis consecutione, p. 46, "mira vero ac singularis est haec versuum consecutio et qualis nusquam in Terentii canticis occurrit." The *dicet* of A may stand for an original *dicetis* which was addressed to the audience and which was misread *dicet is*, but I make no attempt here to reconstruct the lines. If we consider how modern editors have changed And. 478 and similar passages, we may conceive of the ancients being even bolder in their emendations. That the passage in question lends strong authority to the *ne : vero* glosses I think no one will deny. The same service is rendered for the *ne : ergo* glosses by another passage in Terence. And. 849 f. (V 2, 8):

Étiam tu hoc respónde, quid istic tíbi negotist? DA. Míhin? SI. Ita.
DA. Míhine. SI. Tibi ergo. DA. Módo ego intro ivi. SI. Qúasi ego quam dudúm rogem.

Mihine DGP, *michine* BCE. For *responde* see Becker, Studemund's Stud. p. 177 f. In Priscian (Keil II, p. 286) we read, "Ἦ conjunctio tam completiva quam confirmativa invenitur apud illos . . . quomodo apud nos *vero* et *autem* . . . similiter *nam*, *enim*, *ergo* non solum causales vel rationales sed etiam completivae et confirmativae inveniuntur." To this doctrine he recurs later on (Keil II, p. 337), "Nostri quoque frequenter *ergo* repletivi loco accipiunt. Terentius in Andria, *Mihine? Tibi ergo.*" In another place (Keil II, p. 100) he says of *ergo*, "invenitur tamen etiam pro expletiva ut Terentius in Andria *Mihine? Tibi ergo.*" The affirmative force of *ergo* in early Latin has been frequently pointed out by modern

[1] Cf. Opusc. V, p. 371.

[2] Cf. however Eun. 930.

scholars. Ussing in a note on Amphitruo 172 remarks that it is equivalent to the German 'ja.'[1]

Now it is a little singular that nowhere in Plautus in answer to the questions *mihine? egone?* do we find *tibi ergo* or *tu ergo*. The following instances occur, however, of *ne*, used in such an answer. Trin. 634 (III 2, 8):

Égone? LES. Tune. LYS. Quíd male facio? LES. Quód ego nolo, id quóm facis, *tune* BCD.

Epid. 575 (IV 2, 6):

Tú homo insanis. PER. Égone? PH. Tune. PER. Quór? PH. Quia ego istanc quaé siet
ego ne J *tune?* B *tu ne* J *tune* E cf. Goetz' ed. of Curculio p. xv.

Stich. 635 (IV 2, 51):

Égone? tune. míhine? tibine. víden ut annonást gravis?
EGONE TUNE MIHINE TIBINE (sic cum spatiis) A.
egone? tune? mihine? tibine? BCD.

Capt. 857 (IV 2, 77):

Égone? ER. Tune. HE. Túm tu mi igitur érus es. ER. Immo bénevolens.

Sonnenschein does not state whether *tu* is separated from *ne* in the MSS. To these, two other passages have been added by emendation. Most. 955 (IV 2, 38):

Égone? AD. Tune. TH. Né molestu's: síne me cum pueró loqui.
So Fleckeisen, Philol. II. p. 92. *Egone tu tu ne molestus* BC. *tutune* D.

Mil. 439 (II 5, 39):

Égone SC. Tune. PH. Quáe heri Athenis Éphesum adveni vésperi.
tu. MSS. *tu ne.* Ritschl.

It will be seen that the authority of the best MSS. so far as known to us, favors the writing of *tune* as one word. This is actually done by Goetz in Epid. 575, who also retains as we have seen *haecine* in Epid. 73, and *hicine* in Epid. 541. But the other editors write *tu nĕ*, and explain *nĕ* as the asseverative particle which in older editions appears as *nae*. In this they follow Fleckeisen, who in the second volume of the Philologus, p. 61 ff. has given a most admirable and exhaustive treatment of *nĕ* in its various uses. On p. 91 he sets apart by themselves the

[1] Lorenz Philologus 32, p. 296, has a good note on *ergo*, in which he shows that this is only a partial statement of the truth. There is indeed danger of losing out of sight the causal force which may be combined with the confirmative.

instances of *nĕ* which we have just cited, as exceptional both in position and in force. With so much the more reason can we claim that the *ne* is enclitic. No metrical tests can show that the *e* of *ne* is long, as it is found in the thesis. On the other hand, in the passage from Stichus the rapidity of movement and the equipoise between question and answer in both pairs *Egonĕ? tunĕ. mihinĕ? tibinĕ.* is quite destroyed if we read *Egonĕ? tu nē. mihinĕ? tibi nē.* Moreover, if we change the quantity we lose the mocking echo of the answer, which perhaps more than anything else contributed to keeping these formulas alive so long. We may well compare the use of *nempe*[1] in Rud. 565–7:

> Némpe meae? SC. nempe néscio istuc. LA. Quá sunt facie? SC. Scítula:
> Vél ego amare utrámvis possim sí probe adpotús siem.
> LA. Némpe puellae? SC. Némpe molestu's: í, vise [intro] sí lubet.

Thornton renders the last line very well, "And young forsooth? SC. Forsooth you're plaguey troublesome." With this passage in mind I prefer to read in Most. 955,[2] TH. *Égonĕ?* AD. *Tunĕ.* TH. *Túnĕ molestu's*, giving to *nĕ* in each case a force bordering on that of *nempe*, "I forsooth?—you forsooth!—Sooth you are troublesome:" with suitable voice-inflection. My reading is nearer to *tu tune* of the MSS., inasmuch as I only add a *ne* which might easily have dropped out, whereas Fleckeisen inserts *ne* and omits *tu*. Ussing regards the *ne* as asseverative and reads *Egone? — Tu.—tu nē*, etc., which is inadmissible if *ne* is enclitic and short. Moreover, the accentuation *tu né* does not elsewhere occur. I must not omit to state here that Scaliger seems to have identified the *ne* in these examples with the enclitic *nĕ* often affixed to relatives. At least I have found in the Codex Parisinus 11305, which bears in the catalogue the title "Notes de Scaliger sur Plaute," the following annotations: To Trin. III 2, 8, "*Egone? Tune. Tune* id est *tu* ut in Milite *quemne ego servavi in campis.*" To Amph. II 2, 65 "*quaene* id est *quae* frequentissimum apud Plautum et apud Catullum *Fratrem quemne ipsa reliqui.*" And again to Cist. IV 2, 6, "Quamne in manibus tenui atque accepi hic ante aedis," *quamne* id est *quam.* He doubtless took Priscian at his word where he says that the *ne* of *quine* is affirmative.

[1] Compare also the echoed question Persa 220, Itanest? Itanest? and Persius Sat. II, 19, cuinam? cuinam?

[2] My reading is not possible if one rigidly exclude from Plautus dactyls with trochaic caesura. Before consonants moreover in connected discourse *tun* is the regular form. I should not think of keeping *tune molestus* except as a sort of formula. Metrically *Égone? Tune. Tún molestus* would be better.

Of this affirmative *ne* we have already pointed out four cases of survival in Terence, one in Ennius, and nine in Plautus, to which, if our view be accepted, six more must now be added, occurring in a mocking answer. Terence must have known this use in the plays of Plautus, and probably in the folk-speech of his time. Did he intentionally avoid it, and substitute *ergo* for *ne?* We look in vain for a second example of *ergo* thus used. We know how early in the commentaries of Vergil the glossing of *ne* with *ergo* became common. We do not know whether Donatus found *tibi ergo* in his codex. Long before Priscian and the author of what is known as the Calliopian recension, the gloss *ergo* might have supplanted *ne* in the text. A glossarist would not have taken the trouble to change *mihine*, which is metrically impossible if we read *tibi ergo*, to *mihin*. On the other hand, had Terence himself written *mihin*, the scribe who in v. 849 was very careful to keep *mihin?* even before a vowel, would hardly have written *mihine*. *Mihin* occurs in And. 476, Phorm. 506, 1048, with no MS. variation. Unfortunately this verse is not found in the Bembinus; Hertz tells us at least that only an N can be made out after the beginning of the verse. Umpfenbach does not even record this. Perhaps a closer scrutiny might at least show whether there was space for *tibi ergo*. I feel quite confident that Terence wrote *mihin' ? tibin'*. If it shall be decided that he wrote *tibi ergo*, I shall make him responsible for the *ne : ergo* glosses, and shall thus through Priscian indirectly prove the affirmative nature of the enclitic particle *ne*.

If any one has had the patience to follow me thus far, he will naturally be inclined to ask for a more explicit statement of my views in regard to the interrogative particle *ne*, and its relations to the affirmative particle, which has up to this point formed the subject of discussion. To avoid all misunderstanding, I wish to state distinctly at the outset my belief in the existence of an interrogative particle *ne* of negative origin, the limits of whose use, however, must I think be drawn more closely than they have been hitherto. When I find that Haut. v. 563 *vidin ego te?* is cited by Julius Rufinianus as *non ego te vidi? ;* when I find in Cod. Par. 7900 A, *edixin* And. 495 and *divin* Adelph. 83 glossed by *nonne edixi* and *nonne dixi*, and when I find Remigius in his commentary on Martianus Capella (Cod. Par. 8674) explaining *coepistine* (cf. Eyssenhardt, p. 300) by *nonne coepisti*, I do not say that the authors of these glosses have confused the facts,[1] but I infer that to

[1] Hand Turs. IV, p. 77, says of Priscian *omnia miscuit.*

them the negative force of *ne* is as clear and sharp as the negation in *can't*, *won't*, etc., is clear to an English speaker.

On the other hand, when Priscian tells me that *nĕ* is sometimes affirmative, citing in illustration passages most apposite, as I have tried to show; when numerous glosses representing ancient tradition interpret *ne* to mean *vero*, *ergo*, *enim* and *etiam*; when every one admits that *sin* is equivalent to *si vero*; I cannot shut my eyes to all this testimony and declare that *nĕ* is purely and simply negative, and that hence all the phenomena in its use must be made to square with the negative conception. Nor can I intrench myself as Hand[1] does behind the profound philosophical observation that every question implies doubt, and that all doubt borders upon negation, and that hence every question contains a negative element, which very naturally finds its expression in *nĕ*. Practically speaking every question does not imply doubt, and does not so far as expression is concerned call for a negative element. If we look at the hard facts of language we shall find Plautus in 563 questions and Terence in 346 employing no interrogative particle or pronoun whatever, and that, too, in questions exactly parallel to those in which Hand assigns to *ne* a negative force. We shall find, moreover, *vero* occasionally taking the place of *nĕ*, and here and there *enim* and *nempe* in questions for which editors in some cases have actually substituted *ne*. The Greeks use ἦ; we ourselves employ *really* and *truly* in interrogation. But *vero*, *enim*, *nempe*, ἦ, and *really*, are by nature affirmative. No *a priori* reasoning, therefore, can bar out the possibility of an affirmative *nĕ*. For myself I see no reason for dissociating the forms *egone*, *tune*, *hicine*, etc. found in direct statements, where any negative notion is of necessity excluded, from the same forms found in questions. In commenting on Eun. V 4, 41, Donatus says, "*Obsecro an is est?* insultantis ut in Phormione (945). *Ah! tune is eras?* nam sciebat eum esse.' Hand would of course translate, *Ah, you were not he?* but it is difficult to conceive why there must of necessity be a negative force in *tune is* which does not reside in *an is?* Shakespeare in As You Like It, III 2, 410, makes Rosalind say, "But in good sooth are you he that hangs the verses on the trees?" after Orlando has confessed the act. Cf. All's Well that Ends Well, V 3, 47:

> PAR. O my good lord, you were the first that found me!
> LAF. Was I in sooth? and I was the first that lost thee.

This affirmative sense, *in sooth*, with the various shades of mean-

[1] Tursellinus IV, p. 71.

ing which it may be made to take on by different modulations of the voice, is, I claim, far more natural for *ne* where irony, surprise, indignation and kindred emotions are to be expressed, than the simply negative force. I need only mention here the ironical use of *vero* (cf. Donatus to Eun. V 2, 69, "*vero*, εἰρωνικῶς ut *egregiam vero laudem*.") A very good instance of this is seen in And. 917, *Est vero huic credendum, Chreme*, which the early editors punctuate as a question. I conceive *ne* to have a force very like this in Trin. 960 f:

> Quem égo qui sit homo néscio
> Néque oculis ante húnc diem umquam vídi, *eine* aurum créderem?
> BCD *ei nemirum*.

In treating the several cases of survival of the formula *egone? tune*. I have tried to prove that the *ne* of the answer is an echo of the *ne* in the question, and that the two stand in very much the same relation to each other as the two *nempe*'s (to take another example) in Aul. 290:

> CO. Nempe húc dimidium dícis, dimidium domum?
> ST. Nempe sícut dicis.

The whole tone here is of course quite different from that of the *egone?* questions.

In Adelph. 770 I have pointed out an instance of the survival of *tun* before a condition, *tun si meus esses*, with the force of *tu vero*. But this does not differ in any essential respect from the *tun* found in Phorm. 932, *tun hanc duceres, si tibi daretur?* nor from a hundred other *tun*'s which I might cite. It is simply a matter of voice-inflection, and the *ne* in the earliest period of its use was something more than a mere sign. Of course I do not claim that, when with the constant friction to which the commoner coins of language are exposed, the particle had become reduced to a single letter, its force was vividly felt by the people who used it, any more than I would claim that ordinary English speakers attach any force to the *s* of *as* or *such* or recognize its connection with the *so* of *also*. No Roman had any feeling for the *c* in *sic* or *hoc* as a separate element in a compound word. In this respect the affirmative particle *ne* was at a great disadvantage compared with the negative. Every Englishman has at least a vague sense of the separate force of *n* in *nought* and *none*, and the *nt* in *sha'n't*, and every Roman would feel clearly the difference between *dixin* and *dixi*. An affirmative particle would be much more likely to fade out into a mere sign. Yet that the abridged forms *ten*, *men*, *tun* were used for emphasis long after the *n* had ceased to have for the

speaker any independent value, cannot be doubted. In this light I think we must interpret such scholia as the following: Donatus to And. II 3, 10, *Egon dicam? Τὸ ego* emphasim habet; And. III 2, 12, *Itan contemnor:* hoc est *adeone contemnor, valde contemnor;* And. I 5, 28, *Eine ego ut adverser?* Pronomen hoc vim qualitatis habet; et est *cur tali, tam bono* (cf. Hec. I 1, 13); And. II 6, 4, *Nihilne* est εὐφημισμὸς antiquorum pro *nihil* (cf. *nihil enim*, Hec. 850). In like manner Servius to Verg. Aen. II, 657, *Mene efferre*, etc., nam pronomina habent vim suam nonnumquam et emphasim. Both commentators must have had, I think, a dim sense of the latent force of *ne*, although they could give it no adequate expression in words. Servius is quite as much at a loss to explain *enim* in Verg. Aen. VIII 84:

Quam pius Aeneas tibi enim, tibi, maxima Juno,

"vacat *enim* et tantum ad ornatum pertinet," and yet we know that Vergil has ventured to refresh here in *enim* that strong asseverative force in which alone it is known to Plautus. Nothing can illustrate better the danger of looking at early Latin through Ciceronian spectacles than this very word *enim*. Only fifteen years ago William Ramsay, in his edition of the Mostellaria, p. 206, could say: "We maintain that in the early writers *enim vero* signifies 'for in truth,' as *enim* always signifies 'for.'" Our much despised Priscian might have taught him better (Keil II, p. 103 and 104), "Invenitur etiam pro affirmativa, ut Terentius in Andria (I 3, 1), *Enim vero Dave nihil loci est*, etc., et maxime praepositiva hanc habet significationem, et idem in Adelph. (II 1, 14) *enim non sinam.*" It was reserved however for Langen in 1880 (Beitr. p. 261–271) to show that *enim* does not occur before Terence in any other than asseverative force, and that only rarely in Terence does it mean *for*. I think we shall not err if in some passages of Plautus and Terence we reinforce the original asseverative or affirmative meaning of *nĕ*. Certainly *tune* in answer was stronger than *tu*, and German editors are fond of translating it 'du ja.' So too *ne* in a question frequently corresponds to *enim* or *vero* in the answer. I might multiply instances, but the following will suffice: Adelph. 924, *Tun iubes hoc? — Ego vero iubeo.* Pseud. 979, *Tune's Ballio? — Ego enim vero is sum* (cf. Epid. 541, *Hicinest*). Persa 185, *ain vero? — aio enim vero* (cf. Amph. 344). Amph. 758, *Tun dicis? — Tun negas? — nego enim vero.* Compare *itane vero?* in Rud. 971 with *ita enim vero?* Rud. 1003, *quiane* in Most. 1132.

Vérbero etiam inrídes? TR. Quian me pró te ire ad cenam áutumo?

and Persa 850 with *quia enim* in Merc. 648, Mil. 1140, Pers. 228, and especially Truc. II 2, 11,

Qúid tibi ego maledíco? STR. Quia enim me trúncum lentum nóminas,

enim me ABCD; *me*, Spengel, on account of metre. Fleckeisen, Jahrb. 101, p. 702, omits *ego* and retains *quia enim*. Had Plautus used *quian me* in direct statement, I think his contemporaries would have understood him, as Horace's friends doubtless understood *quine putetis*, and *nemon ut* (Sat. I 1, 108; Keller and Holder, *nemo ut* with hiatus). I should not venture however to put *quian me* in the text.

One of the most common uses of *ne* in Plautus is in connection with the exclamatory infinitive: so Asin. 226 *Haécine te esse oblítum in ludo quí fuisti tam diu!* With this may be compared Cic. de Fin. II 10, 29, *Hoc vero non videre!* which Madvig thus explains, *Hoc vero credibile est eum non videre?* (see And. 625, *hocinest credibile?* and compare Lucret. II 16 *nonne videre?* with Lachmann's note). Cic. ad Att. VII 2, 8, *Chrysippum vero, quem ego . . in honore habui, discedere a puero!* It is evident that *vero* in the Ciceronian passages performs the same office as *nĕ* in Plautus, and that *nonne*[1] in the Lucretian passage is equivalent to *non vero* and is not a compound of two negatives like *nonnumquam*, in which case we should expect the negative force to be lost. In view of such passages I do not see how one can dismiss lightly the *ne · vero* glosses or attribute them to some ignorant glossarist. The late Prof. Fritsche may very possibly have held to the negative origin of *nĕ*, but if so, he translated Hor. Sat. II 4, 83 *ten-radere*, etc., better than he knew, "musst du denn wirklich?"

I now pass to the most difficult part of my task. It is a disadvantage to be a foundling, and many particles live under a sort of social ban because they cannot point to a family tree. What a stigma attaches to *haud* because it cannot prove its paternity! How much more ready we are to admit *non* into the society of our pet adjectives! Clearly relations and a respectable ancestry must be found for *ne*, else it will still rest under the baneful suspicion of being nothing more than a bastard negative, whose true origin has for family reasons been concealed. The most expeditious way to dispose of it would no doubt be to father it upon the asseverative *nē*. This Schoemann (Lehre von d. Redetheilen, p. 221) has done, calling it "die abgeschwächte Form" The temptation to do

[1] Spengel is, I think, mistaken in denying *nonne* to Plautus and Terence. It was used like *anne* and *namque* before vowels, and if we can trust the MSS. it was not confined to questions; see Merc. 62, *nonne ut* Phorm. 969, *nonne hercle*.

this is strong, and in declaring against it I have not overlooked the striking affinity between passages like Haut. 918 and Haut. 950. This resemblance is due to the fact that both *nĕ* and *nē* are to be referred to a common pronominal stem which for convenience sake we may with Fick call *na* (cf. Wörterbuch d. Indo-Germ. Sprach. I, p. 122). To this he assigns the office of strengthening other pronouns (Skr.-*na* in *e-na*, Zend *na* enclitische Partikel in *kém nâ* (*quem-nam*), *-na* in *ci-na* wer, *daéna* f. das selbst (?) + νή, ναί traun, versichernd, -νη in ἐγώ-νη, τύνη ; -να in δεῖ-να derselbige, -ν- in τι-ν-ός, τι-ν-ί, τι-νά, lat. *nē*, *nae*, traun, versichernd, *na-m* in *quisnam*, wer doch, *n* in *nu-n-c* u. s. w., Goth. *-n* in *hun*, *ains-hun*.) The Latin language seems to have gone its own way in the development of this stem, and to have been more prolific than any of the cognate tongues. I owe to M. Bréal the following clear statement regarding it (see Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris, I, p. 195,): "*na* avait à l'origine un sens démonstratif. Il a donné l'adverbe interrogatif *num* et avec le *c* enclitique *nunc* acc. m.; la conjonction *nam* acc. f., la particule interrogative *nĕ* dont la flexion casuelle a tout-à-fait disparu, ou qui peut-être n'en a jamais eu. La forme secondaire *ni* a donné l'accusatif *nem* dans *nempe*. De plus notre pronom s'est conservé comme enclitique sous les formes *nam* et *num* dans *quisnam* et *etiamnum*." Etymologists generally have derived *nempe* from *nam-pe* without taking the trouble to explain on what phonetic principle *nam* + *pe* gives *nempe* while *nam* + *que* gives *namque*. Bréal, as we see, assigns to *nem* a distinct origin. What if *nem* itself be the fuller form of the enclitic *nĕ* which Bréal admits may have lost a case ending? The Latin language would then have started with three particles of similar formation, *nam*, *nem*, and *num*, all of which were used in interrogations, though not confined to them; while *nem* from the greater frequency of its enclitic use had lost its final *m* before the literary period. The independent existence of *nem* is tacitly admitted by Corssen, Ausspr. II, p. 640, when he says: "Ehe die enklitische Partikel *-pe* an *nem-* antrat, war das *m* auslautend, also schwach nachklingend; diesen schwachen verschwindend kurzen Laut behielt es auch vor der Anfügung *-pe*, wie das *m* von *enim* in der Tonverbindung von *enim vero*. So ward *nempe* mit verschwindend mattem und kurzem labialen Nasallaut gesprochen fast wie **nĕpe* und so bei den Bühnendichtern gemessen." *Nepe* is found, too, in the MSS. in Trin. 328 in BCD, where Ritschl remarks *memorabili indicio pyrrhichiacae mensurae*, and in Trin. 966 in D. The vanishing of the nasal sound is perhaps still more clearly

proved by a gloss which I have found in the Cod. Bern. 224, saec. X, p. 217, *neppe : certe.* *Neppe* is found according to Ribbeck in Verg. Georg. III 259 in c = Cod. Bern. 184, saec. IX, to which our gloss may refer.

The independent existence of *nem* receives further support from a gloss of Festus (Müller, p. 162), *Ne*-mut, nisi etiam vel *nempe usus est Cato de pot. tr*-ibunici †, cum ait: "nemut . . . aerumnas." The letters italicized are due to conjecture. Paulus (Müller, p. 163) gives simply 'nemut nisi etiam, vel nempe.' Meyer and Duebner, Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta, p. 168, assign the mutilated fragment to Cato's oration 'de Tribunis Militum,' which was probably delivered in the year 171 B. C. (see Jordan's ed. of the Fragments, Proleg. p. lxxxiv). We cannot be absolutely certain however that Verrius Flaccus did find the words in Cato. Now, as the loose compounds *sicut*, *velut*, *praeut* and *prout* presuppose the existence of *sic*, *vel*, *prae* and *pro*, so a compound *nemut* presupposes the existence of *nem*, and it is clearly quite improbable that *nam* + *ut* should ever give *nemut*. I need not rehearse here the familiar facts in regard to the dropping of *m* final in the Roman folk-speech from the earliest times. If now we posit a form *tunem* for an early period we might expect to see it reduced to *tune* and finally to *tun*, just as *noenum* becomes *noenu* and finally *non*. And as *non* is the regular form even in Plautus, occurring hundreds of times, while *noenum* has good MS. authority in only one passage Aul. 67 (l 1, 28, see Ussing's note and Langen Beit. p. 263) although used as an archaism by Lucilius and Lucretius, so under the most favorable circumstances we could not expect more than two or three cases of the fuller form *nem* in the MSS. of Plautus. If I were asked to give examples where *nem ut* might have been used in a pre-Plautine period, I should give the following:

> Egone(m) út te adversum méntiar, matér mea (Aul. 682).
> Egone(m) út cavere néqueam, quoi praedícitur (Pseud. 516).
> Hicĕne(m) út a nobis hóc tantum argenti aúferat (Phorm. 955).
> Núnc agitas sat túte tuarum rérum; egone(m) ut. opem té mih i
> Férre putem posse ínopem? (Bacch. 637).

Ritschl omits *ne* and does not consider it a question. Dombart in Blätt. f. bayer. Gymnas. u. Realschulwesen, 1880, p. 40, claims that *nam* was originally asseverative by nature: "*nam*, *enim* und *vero* sind ursprünglich versichernd und bedeuten 'in der That.' Daraus entwickelte sich früher bei *nam* später bei *enim* eine begründende und erläuternde Bedeutung." As the comic poets use *nam quis* for the classical *quisnam*, so *nem*, as is proven

by *nempe*, was not always enclitic. In an early period we might conceive of it taking the place of *nam* in the following sentence, Cist. IV 1, 10. I give the reading of Pareus:

> Nam hercle ego illam anum inridere me ut sinam? satiu'st mihi
> Quovis exitio interire.

Terence could only use *nem* as an enclitic and for him the *m* was irrecoverably lost. Compare for instance with the above passage, Eun. 771:

> Hancíne ego ut contuméliam tam insígnem in me accipiám Gnatho?
> Morí me satius est.

Primarily the difference in meaning between *nam* and *nem* in such questions could not have been very great. *Nam* and *enim* often border very closely on one another, and again diverge widely in their use. *Quia enim*, so frequently found in Plautus and Terence, is quite different from the archaic *quianam*, but quite like *quiane* (for *quianem*), as I have tried to show above. So we need not be surprised to find *utin* differing both from *utinam* and from *ut enim* in Epid. 277. EP *Út enim praestinés argento, príusquam veniat fílius*, cf. Cas. 165, Pœn. 845. *Utine* in fact is nothing more nor less than an inverted *nemut*, to which it stands in the same relation that *curnam* stands to the Plautine *nam cur*. I cite here all the passages of its occurrence in Plautus and Terence. Epid. II 2, 41 (225):

> Útin inpluvium indúta fuerit? AP. Quíd istuc tam mirábilest?

Merc. III 3, 15 (576):

> Senéx hirquosus, tu aúsculere múlierem?
> Utíne adveniens vómitum excutias múlieri?

Rud. IV 4, 19 (1063):

> DAE. Grípe animum advorte ác tace.
> GR. Útin istic prius dícat? DAE. Audi lóquere tu. GR. Alienón prius.

Phorm. V 6, 34 (874):

> Sómnium: utin haec ignoraret suóm patrem? GE. Aliquid crédito.

Hec. II 1, 2 (199):

> Pro deum átque hominum fidém, quod hoc genus est, quae haéc est conjurátio!
> Utin ómnes mulierés eadem aeque stúdeant nolintque ómnia.

But I must defer till another time any special discussion of the interrogative use of the affirmative *nĕ*. The cases where *nĕ*

strengthens a relative, of which there are some twenty-five in Plautus and Terence, are perhaps the most interesting, inasmuch as here the close relation between *ne* and *nempe* is most clearly seen. Here too as in the case of *nempe* we shall often have difficulty in deciding whether there is any real question involved. I find for instance that Bothe anticipates my view in not regarding Cist. IV 2, 6 as a question. I cite from his edition, without making myself responsible for his metre:

Quamne in manibus tenui atque accepi hic ante aedis cistellam, ubi ea est, Nescio; nisi ut opinor, loca haec circiter excidit mihi.

Tyrrell in his excellent edition of the Miles, at verse 62 points out that this usage is very similar to the Hibernicism *sure*, "sure they both asked me." He reads *quae me ambae obsecraverint*, without a question, where Bentley and Scioppius read *quaene . . .?* At 973 he reads *quae cupiat*, where Ritschl and Brix *quaen cupiat?* In both cases I should keep *ne* without a question. Ussing in Epid. 444 (449 Gz.) keeps *nempe quem in adulescentia*. Goetz, as we have seen, unwilling to admit *nempe*[1] under the ictus, reads with Acidalius *quemne*. If we accept this reading, the change to *nempe quem* must be referred to an early revision, whose author recognized the connection between *nempe* and *ne(m)*. Doubtless a Roman soldier in the first Samnite war might have said *nem quem*, just as our Plautine hero in v. 462 says *nam quid parcam?*

I have before alluded to certain points of contact between the Plautine use of *enim* and of *nē*. I look upon *enim* not as a compound of *nam*, but of *nem*, or rather *nim*, to which it stands in the same relation as *equidem* to *quidem*. I say of *nim*, for I think it probable that, as we have of *is* both the accusatives *em* and *im*, so *nim* may have existed side by side with *nem*, although in less common use. A closer scrutiny of the MSS. may reveal a very few cases of *nē* = *nem*, but I hardly expect it. Even if some slight vanishing nasal sound were heard in the time of Plautus, it would probably not have been represented by any written sign, and later scribes certainly would not introduce a sound which had died away in the language. I attach no importance, therefore, to a corruption like *ei nemirum* for *eine aurum* in Trin. 960 BCD, as *aurum* often becomes *mirum* in MSS.[2] Should *nem* be found in A, that would

[1] The metrical question is still an open one, cf. Pseud. 353, 1189 Rud. 565, Bacch. 188, and Müller Plaut. Pros. p. 433 ff.

[2] Curc. 10, Egone ápicularum is cited by Priscian as ego nam, etc.

be a different matter. I hope no one will call me rash or inconsistent if following the MSS. quite closely I propose *nim* as a possible reading in two passages which have sorely vexed the editors. The first is Trin. 922, where B has *ancharesancharmides θ mim charmides.* C and D have *Anchares ancharmides min charmides.* See Ritschl's critical note and Brix. 3d ed. for the various emendations which have been proposed; *mim* has been changed to *numne, numnam, anne, ain, num* and *enim.* My own view receives its best illustration from Terence, Phormio 307. Demipho exclaims in anger:

hóminem conmonstrárier
Mihi istúm volo aut ubi hábitet demonstrárier,

to which Geta, as if pretending not to know certainly, replies, *Nempe Phormionem?* Langen, in his very valuable article on *nempe*, Beitr. p. 125 ff., translates. 'Du meinst *wohl* den Phormio?' and remarks: "Der Hinweis auf Phormio ist nicht so sicher das Plautus hier *nempe* gebraucht haben würde." Now it seems to me unquestionable that an earlier generation might have used *nem* or *nim Phormionem* where Terence uses *nempe*, and with strong affirmative force. It is perhaps a solitary survival of this use which we have here. Ribbeck in Rhein. Mus. XXVII, p. 179, proposes:

SYC ád hoc exemplumst: Chár. CH Chares? an Chármides? SYC enim Chármides: Ém istic erat.

I should read *nim* for *enim*, attaching to it the same sense. Paleographically *nim* = *min* of CD. Moreover I agree with Brix 3d ed. that the future *erit* must be kept.[1] The other passage is Merc. 767,

CO. Ni(m) métuis tu istanc. LYS. Sápio: nam mihi únicast.
Ni metuis libri, *Num metuis* Camerarius

Ne metuis h. e. *metuisne* Meursius. Ritschl reads *nempe metuis.* It may be a mere accident that *nempe* is not found in Plautus associated with the verb *metuo. Enim* is thus found, Pers. 319: *Enim métuo ut possim reícere in bubíle, ne vagéntur*, cf. Cas. 281, Mil. 429. Some may therefore prefer to substitute *enim* as Ritschl has *nempe* for *ni*, but I think we shall do better to keep the simple

[1] Or following the MSS. still more closely we may read: SYC. ád hoc exemplumst án Chares an Chármides CH nim Chármides? SYC Ém istic erit. For an—an cf. Epid. 223, cf. Langen Beit. p. 266.

particle, from which, according to my view, the others are derived. It may have been even in Plautus' time an archaism in this usage, as *noenu* was for Lucretius. The bantering tone is very evident: 'Sooth you're afraid of her.'

I am moreover emboldened to keep *nim* by the following gloss found in Cod. Bern. A 92, 1, saec IX, p. 14, *nim: ni, nisi, si non*, of which no doubt the earliest form was *nim: ni, nisi* and *si non* having been added later to explain *ni*. It is easy to dismiss such a gloss with a shrug of the shoulders as the absurd attempt of some ignorant scholiast to explain away a corruption in the MSS. But it is unfair to pronounce sentence upon a gloss of which we do not know the context. No doubt many of the 'happy emendations' of modern times, did we but know it, are only ingenious attempts to explain what for the ancients needed no explanation. So *hic nunc* has been substituted for *hicine*, and *egomet* for *egone*. Spengel in Truc. II 6, 52 f. reads:

> Ís te dono. PHR. Póenitetne té, quot ancillás alam
> Qui étiam alienas súperadducas, quaé mihi comedínt cibum?
> *Quin etiâ men super adducas* BCD.

Haupt (Hermes III, p. 229) proposes to read *Quine examen super adducas*. Dombart (Philol. XXVIII, p. 735) *Quin etiam mi insuper adducas*, which reading I accept as being nearest to the MSS. But I differ from Dombart inasmuch as I regard *quin*, with Haupt, as equal to *quine*, i. e. *quine(m)*. It is very like Horace's 'quine putetis.' Now Kiessling, whose eminence as a Plautine critic no one will deny, comparing Eun. 1013 and Rud. 579, proposes (Jahrb. 97, p. 634) *ni etiam examen superadducas*, and we must admit with Fleckeisen that the emendation is 'very tempting.' But if my view of the passage is correct, it is quite the same as glossing *ne(m)* or *ni(m)* with *nisi*. So, too, in Bacch. 637 (already cited) we might substitute *nisi etiam* for *egone(m) ut*, and still fairly represent the sense of the passage. I cannot believe that Verrius Flaccus was guilty of a worse blunder than this would be in his gloss, *nem ut: nisi etiam vel nempe*.

MINTON WARREN.

The foregoing Dissertation was originally presented in Latin to the Philosophical Faculty of the Strassburg University and by them accepted in 1879. Owing to the writer's sudden recall to America, its publication was unavoidably deferred. In its present English form (due to practical reasons connected with its insertion in the American Journal of Philology) it has received some modifications. These reprints have the sanction of the Philosophical Faculty of the Strassburg University.

CORRIGENDA ET ADDENDA.

p. 3, l. 10 ff. from bottom, put . . . for period before MI. in each verse.
7, ll. 2, 4, 9 „ „ read *inventu's*.
7, l. 8 „ „ read *repertu's*.
9, l. 20 „ „ read KIC(INEE)S(T).
19, l. 13 „ „ read *Mihine?*
20, l. 17 „ „ on special examination I find that J has *tune?* (sic.)
22, l. 20 from top, omit sentence beginning: Perhaps, According to Studemund only M i.e. the first three strokes of the M of *Mihine?* can be read in the Bembinus.
28, ll. 10, 11, 12 from bottom put interrogation-point at end of each verse.
29, l. 8 from bottom dele period after *prius*.
29, l. 3 from bottom add Hec. I, 1, 9 (66). *Utín eximium néminem habeam?* SY. *Néminem*: